1		HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
8	HENRY "TOM" and LISSA LEBBENS,	CASE NO. C12-5142RBL
9	and their marital community, and THE ESTATE OF ELIZABETH	ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS'
10	FORRESTER,	SUMMARY JUDGMENT
11	Plaintiffs,	
12	v.	
13 14	BOB GREEN SALES ASSOCIATES, INC. d/b/a PARK AVENUE	
15	NUMISMATICS, et al, Defendants.	
16		
17	THIS MATTER is before the Court on Defendants Greenbergs and Bob Green Sales	
18	Associates' Motion for Summary Judgment [Dkt. #52]. The Court has reviewed the materials	
19	filed in support of, and opposition to, the motion, including the competing motions to strike. For	
20	the following reasons the Motion for Summary Judgment [Dkt. #52] is DENIED and the Motion	
21	to Strike embedded in the parties' memoranda are likewise DENIED .	
22	This case is about the sizeable loss suffered in the speculative gold coin market and the	
23	reasons for those losses suffered by plaintiffs. Tom and Lissa Lebens filed suit against the	
24	moving defendants and others who are not involve	d in this motion (Ernest English and spouse

and Carlos Cabrera and spouse) asserting claims of conspiracy, fraud, negligent misrepresentation, unjust enrichment, breach of fiduciary duty and violations of the Consumer 2 3 Protection Act. Defendants allege that plaintiffs cannot meet their burden of proof with admissible evidence. The Court disagrees. 5 Plaintiffs invested through Ernest English for three years. They had acquired a portfolio 6 of some 150 coins. English was in the process of moving from one employer (Blanchard) to his 7 co-defendant's employ (Bob Green Sales Associates d/b/a Park Avenue Numismatics). A deal 8 was structured by which the Lebens would exchange their existing portfolio (150 coins) for two undesignated rare coins and some cash (\$50,000 v. \$35,000). Moving defendants selected the two rare coins. Cabrera came to Washington to deliver the two rare coins and a check for 10 11 \$35,000. At the same time he inventoried the portfolio and took possession of it. Plaintiffs 12 claim that Greenberg valued their portfolio (150 coins) at between \$198,000 to \$205,000. The 13 two rare coins traded in exchange were, at the time, valued at \$54,000. The total value of the 14 two rare coins and the cash was \$89,000. 15 Without more, plaintiffs have asserted a prima facie case of fraud involving all of the defendants including the moving parties. The plaintiffs are entitled to tell their story to a jury. 16 17 The claims that go to the jury will be decided in the jury instructions. The factual circumstances 18 of the transaction(s) will not change by trimming claims at this time. 19 As for the Motion to Strike, the Court has reviewed the objectionable material and has 20 decided the motion on the merits as they are presented in the papers. Credibility is everything in 21 22 23

24

1	this case. Credibility of the witnesses is a matter to resolve by the jury. Defendants Greenbergs	
2	and Bob Green Sales Associates' Motion for Summary Judgment [Dkt. #52] is DENIED.	
3	Dated this 30 th day of August, 2013.	
4		
5	RONALD B. LEIGHTON	
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		